

GS 0444 A US

REMARKS

Paragraph 0030 of the specification has been amended as required by the examiner.

Claims 1 through 7, which were withdrawn from consideration by the examiner as directed to a non-elected species, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to file a divisional application directed to the subject matter of those canceled claims.

Claims 8 through 19 were rejected as anticipated by the Kunii '260 reference. In that regard claim 8 has been amended to recite that a control conduit is connected with the control means and extends between and is operatively connected with each of the actuation means and the pressure control valve or pressure reduction valve. Additionally, amended claim 8 also recites that a pilot pressure that is produced by the control means is conducted through the control conduit to the actuation means and to the pressure control valve or pressure reduction valve. The provision of a pilot pressure by a control means and conducting the pilot pressure to each of a control valve and an actuation means is neither disclosed in nor even remotely suggested by the Kunii reference.

Instead of the claimed pilot pressure provided by a control means and acting on each of the valves, Kunii teaches an electromagnetic linear solenoid 100 (see Kunii, Figure 11) that acts on only one valve. Solenoid 100 is mechanically connected with pressure regulating valve 104 to control the position of the valve spool and thereby regulate the output pressure SC1 from valve 104,

GS 0444 A US

and thereby the control pressure SC provided to a clutch hydraulic chamber from a line pressure supply line 106. And instead of an arrangement such as that claimed in amended claim 8, in which the same pilot pressure acts on each of the valves, in the structure shown in Figure 11 of the Kunii reference, the pressure acting on subvalve 114 of second valve body 116 is the output pressure SC1 from pressure regulating valve 104, which acts through second feedback line 112a. Accordingly, the control system as claimed in amended claim 8 is clearly patentably distinguishable over the teachings of the Kunii reference.

Claims 9 through 18 each depend from claim 8, and therefore the same distinctions as have been noted above with regard to claim 8 apply with equal effect to each of those dependent claims. Moreover, the dependent claims each recite an invention that is further distinguishable over the Kunii reference.

Method claim 19 has been amended in a manner similar to the amendments made to claim 8. As claimed in amended claim 19, a pilot pressure is conducted from the control means to an actuation means that operatively connected with the pressure control valve or pressure reduction valve, and also to the pressure control valve or pressure reduction valve. As noted above in connection with amended claim 8, the Kunii reference neither shows nor suggests such a step, and therefore amended claim 19 is also patentably distinguishable over the teachings of the Kunii reference.

New claims 20 and 21 further recite that the pilot pressure is operative in a direction against respective spring forces that act within the actuation means and within the pressure control valve or pressure reduction

GS 0444 A US

valve. In the Kunii arrangement as shown in Kunii's Figure 11, the feedback pressure acting through feedback line 112 acts in the same direction as that of the spring force of spring 102, whereas that same feedback pressure operates over second feedback line 112a against the spring force of spring 118 in second valve body 116. Again, the Kunii reference shows an entirely different method of control.

Based upon the foregoing amendments and remarks, the claims as they now stand in the application are believed clearly to be in allowable form in that they patentably distinguish over the disclosure contained in the reference that was cited and relied upon by the examiner, whether that reference be considered in the context of 35 U.S.C. § 102 or of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Additionally, the specification amendment corrects a minor informality. Consequently, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested with a view toward the issuance of an early Notice of Allowance.

The examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned attorney if this amendment raises any questions, so that any such question can be quickly resolved in order that the present application can proceed toward allowance.

June 10, 2003

Respectfully submitted,



Alfred J. Mangels
Reg. No. 22,605
4729 Cornell Road
Cincinnati, Ohio 45241
Tel.: (513) 469-0470